

Washington State Board of Education & Professional Educator Standards Board



STATE OF WASHINGTON
PROFESSIONAL EDUCATOR
STANDARDS BOARD



Working Together for Student Achievement

2006 Joint Report

Submitted to:
Governor Chris Gregoire
Legislative Education Committees
Superintendent of Public Instruction

For additional copies of this report, please visit our Web sites:

Washington State Board of Education

Edie Harding, Executive Director

Old Capitol Building
600 Washington Street, Room 253
P.O. Box 47206
Olympia, Washington 98504-7206
(360) 725-6025
FAX (360) 586-2357
www.sbe.wa.gov

Washington State Professional Educator Standards Board

Jennifer Wallace, Executive Director

Old Capitol Building
600 Washington Street, Room 249
P.O. Box 47236
Olympia, Washington 98504-7236
(360) 725-6275
FAX (360) 586-4548
www.pesb.wa.gov

Background and Introduction

Working Together for Student Achievement

A Joint Report from the

Washington State Board of Education

&

Professional Educators Standards Board

Charge from the Legislature

“By October 15th of each even numbered year, the State Board of Education and the Professional Educator Standards Board shall submit a joint report to the legislative education committees, the Governor, and the Superintendent of Public Instruction. The report shall address the progress the boards have made and the obstacles they have encountered, individually and collectively, in the work of achieving the goals in RCW 28A.150.210.” (Basic Education Goals)

In 2005, the Legislature transferred the policy and rule making authority for educator preparation and certification from the State Board of Education (SBE) to the Professional Educator Standards Board (PESB). With the transfer of duties, the Legislature expected the SBE and the PESB to create a collaborative and effective governance system that can accelerate progress toward achieving the goals in RCW 28A.150.210 (1). For details of the specific authorities that were transferred see Appendix A.

In planning this report, the SBE and PESB agreed that beyond a routine report of individual and collaborative efforts, this document could serve as an ongoing joint strategic planning document. Our intent is that this report will outline those mutual goals and objectives which we commit to addressing collaboratively, and identify new processes and structures for accomplishing them.

Table of Contents

Working Together for Student Achievement	1
Our Commitment	4
Appendices A – H	
A. Authority Transfer to PESB.....	6
B. SBE Overview.....	7
C. SBE Membership.....	9
D. SBE Strategic Plan	10
E. PESB Overview	12
F. PESB Membership.....	15
G. PESB Strategic Plan	17
H. Basic Education Goals (RCW 28A.150.210)	28

Working Together for Student Achievement

The Legislature encouraged the State Board of Education (SBE) and the Professional Educator Standards Board (PESB) to create a collaborative and effective governance system to promote student achievement. For all board initiatives discussed in this report, we will work closely with the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) in its efforts, as the agency responsible for implementing the policies of both boards. The mutual goals that we have identified (discussed in greater detail below) and are committed to addressing collaboratively are:

- High Standards for Students and Educators
- Accountability
- Focus on What Works
- Adequate System Supports
- Collaboration and Coherence Pre-K Through Higher Education

High Standards

SBE Overall Goal: Raise student achievement dramatically.

PESB Goal: All Washington educators will be prepared and certified according to high and rigorous standards to ensure they are effective in helping students meet or exceed state learning goals.

Ensuring that our students and educators are meeting the highest possible standards is the paramount goal of both boards. Policy makers must work together to ensure standards for educators and students that are well aligned. Higher education educator preparation must anticipate what students of tomorrow will need to know and be able to do as well as be responsive to changes in expectations for students. For example, a higher level of mathematics taught in earlier grades has implications for the preparation of elementary teachers and for the continuing education and professional development of existing elementary teachers.

Our boards share a particular concern for student achievement in mathematics and ensuring that educators are equipped with the knowledge, skills and resources to get students to higher levels of achievement. Both boards commit to identifying short- and longer-term policy actions that can be taken to improve mathematics instruction in Washington. In 2004, the PESB produced the report "*Math Teachers Count*" which has led to more rigorous standards for future teachers of mathematics and policies to help ensure that those teaching mathematics are well qualified. Two years later, however, the challenge to improve results for students remains, especially for those from disadvantaged backgrounds. Both boards and the SPI intend to convene stakeholders and state-level decision makers to examine current efforts and identify actions needed to continue to improve teaching and learning in mathematics.

Accountability

SBE Objective: Develop an accountability system to support and improve the performance of the K-12 system.

PESB Goal: State policy makers, educators and the public will have access to clear and comprehensive information on educator preparation program quality, focused on positive impact on student learning.

PESB Goal: State policy makers, educators, and citizens will have access to information about the educator workforce, provided through a coordinated state data system, for tracking progress and informing decision making.

Both the SBE and PESB will work toward increased transparency related to the performance and effectiveness of the education system. For the aspects of the system for which we are each responsible, we believe each board must:

- Define the indicators and measures of effective practice;
- Highlight where and what factors contribute to effective practice;
- Ensure that those who are not yet effective are taking the necessary steps and have the adequate resources to improve; and
- Examine performance incentive systems.

This level of transparency related to the performance of the education system requires improved data collection and reporting. For example, both boards are aware that a qualified educator is the most important and impactful resource allocated to our students. We need, and will work to secure, reliable data about whether teacher quality is equitably distributed in Washington State along with other important indicators of system quality.

Focus on What Works

SBE Objective: Target resources on the strategies and practices which are most likely to ensure good student outcomes.

PESB Goal: Incentives and supports for model partnerships that solve real problems and pilot promising practices.

Both boards commit to policy making based on substantial evidence of what is working, not anecdotal information. Our boards will draw from research and experience of other states and collaborate with OSPI and other education organizations and stakeholders to base our policy making on proven and highly promising practices. Both boards are faced with policy challenges, such as raising the achievement of Washington's rapidly increasing population of students who are English language learners and weaving together field-based educator preparation with school improvement strategies. We are committed to sound approaches to address such challenges, because neither time nor state resources should be ill-spent in ensuring we are doing our best for Washington students.

Adequate System Support

SBE Objective: Develop and recommend to the Legislature a new statutory definition of Basic Education that aligns funding with the learning goals and system goals for K-12.

PESB Objective: Educator compensation that is aligned to the State's performance-based system of educator certification.

PESB Goal: All Washington educators will have adequate access to information about, and opportunity to participate in, high-quality professional development that enhances their capacity to positively impact student learning.

For both students and educators, Washington must end the practice of hit or miss resource allocation. We will advocate for sufficient funding to support implementation of a world-class, learner-focused education system. Sustained resources are required to sustain improvements. Our boards are committed to continuing to raise standards for our students and educators; but we believe that higher demands on the system require higher levels of support and recognition tied to state expectations. At the same time, both boards recognize the resource limitations and difficult investment choices facing state policy makers and we commit to helping the Legislature by identifying those investments we believe will produce the best results for students.

Collaboration and Coherence Pre-K through Higher Education

SBE Task: Link early learning, K-12, and post secondary systems so students experience seamless systems.

PESB Goal: Routine cross-sector strategic planning rooted in student performance data.

The SBE and PESB will work collaboratively through the P-20 Council proposed in Governor Gregoire's Washington Learns initiative. If the Council is not adopted, the boards plan to convene a quarterly meeting of executive directors of state policy boards for early learning through higher education to identify shared priorities and specific ways in which individual efforts can be strengthened through collaboration. The boards will also hold joint forums that focus on strategies with implications across the system for increasing student achievement.

Specific to the PESB and SBE, both boards believe that student performance data must be used to drive improvement by both P-12 and educator preparation systems. Currently, student performance data and strategies for school and student learning improvement are not systematically shared with educator preparation programs or used to drive program improvements. Our boards commit to identifying policies and other incentives to engage P-12 and higher education educator preparation in coordinated strategic planning to improve student learning and close the achievement gap.

Our Commitment

Ensuring that state policy enacted by each board is in support of a coherent education system for our students takes more than identifying mutual goals and objectives; it takes a commitment to a new way of operating and interacting with one another. As such, the SBE and PESB commit to the following and will continue to look for changes in practice that will support coherent, system-wide policy making. We are committed to raising student achievement for all of our students.

- Communication and Presence – Each board will designate a liaison to attend the other board's meetings. Each board will then have a standing agenda item during which the liaison will brief the full board so that each board is current on the other's work.
- Leadership and Planning – The executive committees of each board and staff will hold joint meetings to discuss and act on issues of common interest.
- Sharing Knowledge and Perspective – Joint ad-hoc committees will be formed on issues of mutual interest.
- Coordination – Both boards will coordinate efforts with the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction and other boards and agencies that inform the work and are affected by the policy making of both boards.

Appendices

- A. Authority Transfer to PESB
- B. SBE Overview
- C. SBE Membership
- D. SBE Strategic Plan
- E. PESB Overview
- F. PESB Membership
- G. PESB Strategic Plan
- H. Basic Education Act – Goal
(RCW 28A.150.210)

Appendix A

Authority Transfer to Professional Educator Standards Board

Specific areas of authority were transferred from the State Board of Education to the Professional Educator Standards Board (PESB).

- Program Approval – Establish policies and practices for approval of programs leading to educator certification.
- Program Admission and Completion – Establish policies and practices for approval of requirements for entrance to and completion of any educator preparation program.
- Approve Providers – Establish list of in- and out-of-state accredited institutions of higher education whose graduates may be awarded certification.
- Reciprocity – Establish criteria and enter into reciprocity agreements with other states and National Board Professional Teaching Standards.
- Non-traditional Program Approval – Establish policies for approval of nontraditional educator preparation programs.
- Program Standards – Review educator program approval standards every five years beginning 2006.
- Certificates – Specify types and kinds to be issued and conditions for issuance.
- Appeals – Hear appeals from teachers whose certificates have been revoked by OSPI.
- Grants – Authority to apply for and receive grant funds.
- Proceedings – Adopt rules under the Administrative Procedures Act that are necessary for implementation of new responsibilities.
- Data – Maintain data regarding educator preparation programs and their quality, certification, employment trends and needs, and other as appropriate.
- Certification Fees – Establish certification fees; which shall not be less than \$1. Fees may be used only for purposes of pre-certification professional preparation, program evaluation, and professional in-service training programs in accordance with PESB rules.

Transfer of State Board of Education Projects to PESB:

- First People's Language Certification Pilot Program
- Excellence in Teacher Preparation Award
- Minority Teacher Recruitment Project

Appendix B

The State Board of Education Overview

Purpose and Authority of the New State Board

The Governor and the Legislature brought a significant change to Washington's K-12 system by reconstituting the State Board of Education, and altering its role. In the past, the board focused largely on administrative issues, such as school district boundary adjustments and oversight of school construction. The new board retains some administrative duties, but it is now mandated to provide a broad leadership role and the strategic oversight and policy of K-12 education.

RCW 28A.305.130 specifies that the purpose of State Board of Education is to “adopt statewide policies that promote achievement of the goals of the Basic Education Act; provide advocacy and strategic oversight of public education; implement a standards-based accountability system; and provide leadership in the creation of an education system that respects the diverse cultures, abilities, and learning styles of all students.” The State Board has several other specific responsibilities related to the establishment of standards for graduation, and the compliance of schools and districts for annual basic education requirements.

Who is on the Board?

The State Board is composed of sixteen Washington state citizens: five who are elected by school district school board members (three from western Washington and two from eastern Washington), seven appointed by the Governor, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, a representative of private schools elected at-large by the members of the boards of directors of all approved private schools, and two students who are non-voting members. Appointees of the Governor must be individuals who have demonstrated interest in public schools and are supportive of educational improvement, have a positive record of service, and who will devote sufficient time to the responsibilities of the board. For a list of board members see Appendix C.

The Board's Work to Date

In developing its strategic plan this summer, the board consulted with a broad range of stakeholders and partners, including the Governor, legislators, representatives from the Washington Education Association, the Washington Roundtable, the Washington State School Directors' Association, the Association of Washington School Principals, the Washington State Parent Teacher Association, the Washington Association of School Administrators, and other individuals and organizations.

The board also reviewed the ongoing work of Washington Learns, the Governor's blue-ribbon committee on education; several members of the board are also serving on Washington Learns.

The board has a new strategic plan (for details see Appendix D). Using the strategic plan as a framework, the board will lead the development of state policy, provide system oversight and advocate for student success in the K-12 system. It anticipates working closely with the Professional Educator Standards Board, and its other K-12 partners on the overarching goal to raise student achievement dramatically. The board has outlined four key objectives to accomplish this goal. These objectives will:

1. **Develop an accountability system to support and improve the performance of the K–12 system.** An effective accountability system must include:
 - Indicators and measures to identify schools and districts that are effective as well as those needing improvement; and
 - Designation of authority and an agreed upon process that ensures schools and districts take action.
2. **Develop and recommend to the Legislature a new statutory definition of Basic Education that aligns funding with the learning goals and system for K–12.** Urge the Legislature to appropriate sufficient funding to support implementation of the new definition.
3. **Build on the State Board of Education’s capacity to serve as a credible, independent catalyst for positive impact on student learning.**
4. **Target resources on the strategies and practices most likely to ensure good student outcomes.** Specially work with OSPI, the Professional Educator Standards Board, schools, districts and other partners to identify the actions needed to improve achievement in mathematics and science at all levels. Advocate for the adoption of proven and promising practices in graduation requirements, curriculum, teacher preparation and other aspects of quality education.

Among the accomplishments of the new SBE to date:

- Approved a process for the **Washington Assessment of Student Learning (WASL) Cutscores** OSPI will use to identify proposed cutscores for reading and mathematics in grades 3, 5, 6 and 8.
- Reviewing the guidelines, protocols and scoring criteria for the collection of evidence portfolios students may use as an alternative assessment (action will be taken later this fall).
- Streamlining the basic education compliance monitoring process for school districts.
- Developing an action plan to work on high school mathematics issues with OSPI and the PESB.
- Developing a process to identify the scores students must achieve on the mathematics portion of the PSAT, SAT, or ACT to meet or exceed the state standard for mathematics.
- Initiating a review of GED rules and policies with the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges and OSPI.

Appendix C

State Board of Education Membership (16)

- Five elected by local school directors (three from the west side of the state, two from the east side of the state)
- One private school representative elected by the members of the state-approved private schools
- Superintendent of Public Instruction
- Seven Governor Appointees
- Two students selected through a process by the Washington Association of Student Councils. Students do not have voting rights.

Region 1..... Steve Dal Porto, Ed.D.
Region 2..... Phyllis Bunker Frank
Region 3..... Steven W. Floyd
Region 4..... Linda W. Lamb
Region 5..... Warren T. Smith, Sr., Vice Chair
Position 1 Bernal Baca, Ed.D.
Position 2 Amy Bragdon
Position 3 Sheila Fox, Ph.D.
Position 4 Eric Liu
Position 5 Kristina Mayer, Ed.D.
Position 6 Mary Jean Ryan, Chair
Position 7 Jeff Vincent
Private Schools
Representative John C. "Jack" Schuster
Superintendent of
Public Instruction..... Terry Bergeson, Ed.D.
Student Tiffany Thompson, Senior (Central Kitsap School District)
Representatives Zachary Kinman, Junior (Oroville School District)

State Board of Education Staff

Edie Harding, Executive Director
Laura Moore, Executive Assistant
Pat Eirish, Program Manager
Bob Butts, Director of Policy
Sarah Bland, Secretary Administrative/Webmaster
Casey Corr, Communications

Appendix D

STRATEGIC PLAN FOR THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Adopted: September 15, 2006

VISION

The State Board envisions a learner-focused state education system that is accountable for the individual growth of each student, so that students can thrive in a competitive global economy and in life.

GOAL FOR THE K-12 SYSTEM AS A WHOLE—Raise **student achievement** dramatically.

The following tasks will be used to improve student outcomes:

- TASK 1** Enhance the **quality of education** provided to our students. Invest our education resources in the curriculum, methodology, opportunity to learn, and educator development that equips students for work, life, and citizenship in a dynamic world economy.
- TASK 2** Build a system of **shared accountability** for results within K-12. Increase transparency and accountability in the alignment of resources. Use data intentionally to assess the progress of students and the effectiveness of each part of the system.
- TASK 3** Link early learning, K-12, and post-secondary systems so students experience **seamless transitions**.

BOARD MISSION

The State Board's role in the K-12 system is to lead the development of state policy, provide system oversight and advocate for student success.

BOARD OBJECTIVES AND ACTIVITIES

As specified above, board has one overarching goal: ***to raise student achievement dramatically***. In support of this goal, we will focus our efforts on the following four objectives:

- OBJECTIVE 1.** **Develop an accountability system to support and improve the performance of the K-12 system.** An effective accountability system must include:
- Indicators and measures to identify schools and districts that are effective as well as those needing improvement; and
 - Designation of authority and an agreed upon process that ensures schools and districts take action.
- OBJECTIVE 2.** **Develop and recommend to the Legislature a new statutory definition of Basic Education that aligns funding with the learning goals and system for K-12.** Urge the Legislature to appropriate sufficient funding to support implementation of the new definition.

- OBJECTIVE 3.** **Build on the State Board of Education’s capacity to serve as a credible, independent catalyst for positive impact on student learning.**
- OBJECTIVE 4.** **Target resources on the strategies and practices most likely to ensure good student outcomes.** Specifically work with OSPI, the Professional Educator Standards Board, schools, districts and other partners to identify the actions needed to improve achievement in mathematics and science at all levels. Advocate for the adoption of proven and promising practices in graduation requirements, curriculum, teacher preparation and other aspects of quality education.

Appendix E

The Professional Educator Standards Board (PESB) Overview *Quality educators, student success*

Purpose and Authority of the PESB

The PESB was created in 2000 as primarily an advisory board to the Governor, Legislature, State Board of Education, and Superintendent of Public Instruction on the full range of policy issues related to certified education professionals, including teachers, principals, superintendents and educational staff associates. In addition, the PESB was initially charged with creating alternative routes to teacher certification and administering new basic skills and subject knowledge assessments for teacher certification.

Five years later, Governor Gregoire signed into law ESSB 5732, which gave the PESB responsibility and authority for policy and oversight of Washington's system of educator preparation, certification, continuing education and assignment.

RCW 28A.410.210 specifies that the purpose of the PESB is "to establish policies and requirements for the preparation and certification of educators that provide standards for competency in professional knowledge and practice in the areas of certification; a foundation of skills, knowledge and attitudes necessary to help students with diverse needs, abilities, cultural experiences, and learning styles meet or exceed the learning goals outline in RCW 28A.150.210; knowledge of research-based practice; and professional development throughout a career."

"Our energy and commitment to our work on the PESB comes from the knowledge that as we help shape our profession, we have a powerful impact on student learning."
- PESB Member

Specific areas of authority transferred to the PESB are in Appendix A.

Who is on the Board?

The composition of the PESB is directly linked to its purpose. The PESB is a board of practitioners charged with setting and upholding the standards for entering and remaining in their profession, much like boards in law, medicine, engineering, nursing and other professional fields.

The PESB is composed of 21 Governor-appointed members, 18 of whom are practicing educators. Eight are teachers; three are principals; one is a superintendent; two are educational staff associates; three represent colleges of education; one is a citizen; one is a parent; and one seat is designated for the Superintendent of Public Instruction. A list of current board members can be found under Appendix F.

The Board's Work to Date

Accomplishments of the PESB since 2000 are:

- Establishing four new alternative routes through which 537 mid-career professionals and experienced paraeducators have become fully-certified teachers in subject and geographic shortage areas;
- Implementing a new basic skills test and 33 subject knowledge tests required of all teachers seeking their first Washington teaching certificate;
- Raising standards for and improving assessments of future math teachers;
- Creating new pathways for staff associates such as school counselors to become principals and for teachers to add new subject area credentials;
- Creating greater access and opportunity for teachers to gain additional subject matter expertise and add subject endorsements to their teaching certificates and meet "highly qualified" requirements; and
- In our advisory capacity, submitting research-based reports and recommendations that have resulted in changes in state policy and practice, including:
 - Improving implementation of the Professional Certificate for teachers;
 - Aligning compensation with the state's performance-based system of preparation and certification; and
 - Developing a state data system that provides an accurate picture of the state's educator workforce for improved decision making.

The 2005 legislation that established the PESB's current authority required that, in preparation for this new responsibility, the PESB would:

"conduct a comprehensive analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of Washington's educator and administrator certification and preparation systems, and by December 1, 2005, transmit its finding and any recommendations to the legislative committees on education, the superintendent of public instruction, the state board of education, and the governor" and that the board "shall use the analysis to develop a planning document to guide the assumption of policy and rule-making authority responsibilities for educator and administrator preparation and certification, consistent with the board's purpose."

The PESB produced the report *Washington's System of Preparing and Certifying Educators* as a first-of-its-kind primer of the current system and its requirements, an analysis of the strengths of the current system and an assessment of needed changes and improvements.

Among the findings from the report that Washington needs and upon which the PESB will focus its efforts are:

- A state-level system for assessing educator preparation program quality
- Strategic planning across sectors grounded in student performance data

- Incentives and supports for model partnerships that solve real problems and pilot promising practices
- An improved system for maintaining high and relevant preparation standards and certification requirements for all educators
- State-level capacity and coordination in collecting and analyzing critical educator quality data for decision making
- Realistic strategies for ending out-of-field teaching
- Higher standards and a state system for approving and evaluating providers of continuing education
- Enhanced access and expanded program delivery options for educator preparation
- A systemic and strategic approach to educator recruitment
- A state-supported continuum of educator development that extends through an educator's career

From identification of these needs, the board constructed its goals and strategic plans under their new authority and responsibility. These are contained in Appendix G.

Appendix F

As of September 2006

The Professional Educator Standards Board Members:

Jill Van Glubt of Fall City, is Chair of the PESB. Representing public school teachers, she is a teacher at Eastlake High School in the Lake Washington School District.

June Canty, of Battle Ground, representing public higher education, is a Professor and the Director of Education Programs at Washington State University, Vancouver.

Carol Coar, of Gig Harbor, representing educational staff associates, is the school psychologist at Stadium High School in Tacoma.

Gary Cohn, of Port Angeles, representing superintendents, is the Superintendent of Port Angeles School District.

Roger Erskine, of Olympia, representing Washington citizens, serves on the Board of the League of Education Voters.

Shannon Espinoza, of Spokane, representing public school teachers, is a teacher in the Cheney School District.

Vicki Frei, of Clarkston, representing classified instructional employees is a paraprofessional with the Learning Assistance Program in Clarkston School District.

Kathryn A. Nelson, of Bellevue, representing private school teachers, is a special education teacher at Hamlin Robinson School in Seattle.

Dora Noble, of Pasco, representing public school teachers, is a LL/literacy coach at Robert Frost Elementary in the Pasco School District.

Sharon Okamoto, of Seattle, representing private school principals, is the principal of the Seattle Urban Academy in Seattle.

Grant Pelesky, of Puyallup, representing public school teachers, is a teacher at Fruitland Elementary in the Puyallup School district.

Martha Rice, of Yakima, representing parents, is a member of the Yakima School Board.

Stephen Rushing, of Puyallup, representing public school principals, is the principal at Pioneer Valley Elementary School.

Ron Scutt, of Stehekin, representing public school teachers, is the lead teacher at Stehekin School.

Dennis W. Sterner, of Spokane, representing private higher education, is the dean of the school of education at Whitworth College.

Yvonne Ullas, of Yakima, representing public school teachers, is a second-grade teacher at Roosevelt Elementary School in Yakima.

Stacey Valentin, of Silverdale, representing public school teachers, is a special education teacher at Klahowya Secondary School in Seabeck.

Donna Zickuhr, of Anacortes, representing public school principals, is the principal at Anacortes High School.

Vacant, representing educational staff associates

Vacant, representing public higher education

Dr. Terry Bergeson, Washington State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Professional Educator Standards Board Staff:

Jennifer Wallace, Executive Director

Gina Hobbs, Executive Assistant

Dr. Lin Douglas, Director of Alternative Routes

Esther Baker, Program Director, Teacher Assessments

Nasue Nishida, Policy and Research Analyst

Erin Smessaert, Secretary

Appendix G

Professional Educator Standards Board

Goal 1 - A state-level system for assessing educator preparation program quality

The PESB and OSPI need to review all current measures of preparation program quality and complete the development of an improved, ongoing state-level system for assessing program quality. Multiple sources of data, including both quantitative and qualitative measures must be used to make inferences about program quality. The system must document explicit connections between preservice preparation and knowledge and skills required in classrooms and schools, and acknowledge student diversity and the complexities associated with educator characteristics that influence student learning and development, but cannot be measured via quantitative means. Related to this is a current desire, but not yet a means, to assess the relationship between quality measures of educator preparation programs and impact on student learning. It is a complicated research question. The ability to tease-out the impact of an educator's preparation program, from the myriad of other factors that influence student learning, is extremely difficult

Objective Group 1:

- 1A.** Survey all program completers and their employers about educator preparation program quality. Create incentives to ensure high return rates for data reliability.
- 1B.** Reexamine current data demands on institutions and focus institutions' data collection on most relevant indicators of program quality.
- 1C.** Focus each institution's Professional Education Advisory Board's data requirements and plans for improvement on program quality.
- 1D.** Publicly report innovative practices of teacher preparation programs.
- 1E.** Make the reports regarding the assessment of educator preparation program quality available on PESB Web site.

Objective 2: Identify, support, and raise policymaker awareness about state-level evidence-based research projects demonstrating impact of educator preparation, along with other factors on student learning.

Objective 3: Ensure that review process for endorsement programs includes individuals with content-specific expertise related to the endorsement being reviewed.

Ends Policy: State policy makers, educators, and the public will have access to clear and comprehensive information on educator preparation program quality, focused on impact on student learning, to monitor program quality and make necessary changes in policy.

Goal 2 – Ongoing strategic planning across sectors grounded in student performance data

Student performance data must be used to drive coordinated strategic planning between P-12 and higher education to improve student learning and close the achievement gap. Educator preparation, quality of educational practice, and student learning are shared responsibilities. Currently, student performance data and strategies for school and student learning improvement are not systematically shared with educator preparation programs or used to drive program improvements.

Objective Group 1: Facilitate new opportunities for collaborative strategic planning

- 1A.** OSPI School Improvement and educator preparation programs share data and develop collaborative statewide strategies that will inform and impact educator preparation programs.
- 1B.** Educational Service Districts (ESDs), OSPI and educator preparation programs discuss continuing education and inservice professional development that is needed based on student performance data.
- 1C.** P-12 schools (public and private) and educator preparation programs, to enhance preparation environments through more authentic grounding issues and challenges of real practice.

Ends Policy: Educator preparation programs and P-12 state and local leadership will routinely engage in collaborative strategic planning that is grounded in K-12 student performance data to inform programmatic and policy changes needed to improve student learning.

Goal 3 - Incentives and supports for model partnerships

Recognizing the value of field-based experiences in the preparation of educators, we need to increase supports available for partnerships. These formal and informal partnerships must explore and solve specific problems or pilot promising practices in educator preparation and certification. These opportunities to apply research and best practices to real-life situations also have larger implications for system-wide changes in policy and practice

Objective 1:

1A. Secure funding support for the creation of Professional Development Schools where teacher candidates participate in performance-based, mentored internships; university faculty are on-site; lead teachers serve as adjunct faculty for the college of education; and data are collected related to impact of the program on student performance.

1B. Secure funding for a pilot program to convert some Focused Assistance Schools into Professional Development Schools where concentrations of teacher candidates increase ratio to students.

1C. Higher Ed / School partnerships as models of high quality field placements directly linked to school and student learning improvement efforts.

Might also address: incentives and compensation for teachers who supervise student teachers and district long-range forecasting of anticipated openings.

Objective 2: Dissolve institutional barriers/model strategies for effective collaboration between deans/directors of colleges of education and colleges of liberal arts and science to address such issues as:

2A. Institutional strategies for competencies to drive curriculum; including identification of common learner outcomes and needed changes in existing course requirements tied to the learner outcomes; and

2B. Flexibility in faculty load and assignments to facilitate greater direct involvement of university faculty in schools.

Ends Policy: Higher education institutions and school districts will jointly operate field-based partnerships to address challenges or pilot promising practices in both educator preparation and school improvement efforts.

Ends Policy: Deans and directors of colleges of education and colleges of liberal arts and science will operate collaboratively, reflecting shared goals and perspectives, to achieve truly performance-based preparation of educators.

Goal 4 - An agreed-upon and widely understood system for review and revision of high and relevant preparation standards and certification requirements for all educators

Standards for educator preparation and certification need not only to align with today's standards for students, but they also need to be reviewed and revised in anticipation of what our students will need to know and be able to do in the future. The development of these standards must be ahead of the curve, reflecting research and rigorous dialogue regarding the essential knowledge and skills educators will need to possess. Preparation programs must have the time to plan the resources needed and design programs ready to prepare educators for future student needs. In addition, continuous effort must be focused on identifying and eliminating disconnects between educator preparation and the realities of educators' daily jobs.

Objective 1: Study the depth and breadth of subject-knowledge preparation for middle-grade teachers.

1A. Are K-8 endorsement competencies rigorous enough for teaching specific content at the middle level?

1B. Should Washington have a K-6 rather than K-8 endorsement, particularly in light of "highly-qualified" requirements under the No Child Left Behind Act?

Objective 2:

2A. Translate residency certificate knowledge and skill standards for teachers into a common set of performance expectations.

2B. Focus standards on diversity in cultural knowledge and respect; use of technology in a global world; applied learning; and personalization that allows for effective, meaningful connections with students.

Objective 3: Create job imbedded internships that provide opportunities for prospective school principals to acquire the skills and knowledge required for leading high-performing schools.

Objective 4: Ensure that program designs of educator preparation programs reflect the shift to performance-based standards.

Objective 5: Ensure that interstate reciprocity agreements uphold high standards without discouraging entry into the Washington educator profession.

Ends Policy: All Washington educators will be prepared and certified according to high and rigorous standards to ensure they are effective in helping students meet or exceed state learning goals.

Goal 5 - State-level capacity and coordination in collecting and analyzing critical data for decision making.

Educators and policymakers must have appropriate access to useful and comprehensive information about the educator workforce to inform policy development and analysis. Too often the answer to questions posed by the PESB regarding Washington's system of educator preparation and certification and the qualifications of our educator workforce has been "We don't know." For example, no data currently exist that can tell us how many teachers providing instruction in mathematics hold a major or minor in math, whether they hold the appropriate certification for teaching math, whether there is a relationship between student demographics or geographic location and qualifications of math teachers, and whether or not math teachers have access to high quality professional development. Washington lacks this and other critical data needed to inform policy development and to evaluate the effectiveness of implemented policies.

Objective 1:

1A. Secure legislative policy and funding support for development and implementation of an educator workforce data system to inform policy development and analysis; (including ability to track educator assignment and credentials – from Goal 6).

1B. Implementation of electronic/online certification system and central repository of educator credential data.

Objective 2: Improve tracking and accountability related to planning and use of educator certification fees to support educator quality.

Ends Policy: State policymakers, educators and citizens will have access to comprehensive information about the educator workforce, provided through a coordinated state data system, for tracking progress and informing decision making.

Goal 6 - Realistic strategies for ending out-of-field assignment

Greater access, opportunity, and system options for educators to become appropriately credentialed must be created statewide to eliminate the necessity for out-of-endorsement assignment. The best systems of preparation and certification are of little impact if educators are not assigned in the field in which they were prepared and certified. There are widely varying opinions about the scope of out-of-field assignment in Washington, but the bottom line is, we don't really know. Washington State does not collect teacher assignment data related to endorsement or degree. We do know that Washington regulations related to out-of-endorsement assignments were created to allow needed flexibility, particularly for rural and remote districts having difficulty finding appropriately-credentialed teachers. We also know resoundingly from research that teachers possessing adequate understanding of the subjects they teach is critical to student learning. Yet the number of districts granting assignment waivers has increased by over 40% since 2000 and that it is a problem nationwide.

Objective 1: Create more options, access, and incentives for educators to gain additional endorsements.

Objective 2:

1A. Limit the renewal of conditional certificates paired with options for conditionally-cert educators to become fully credentialed.

1B. Review and place time limit on existing endorsement-related assignment policy in WAC.

Objective 3: Conduct an examination of the influence of local hiring practices / local contract agreements related to assignment.

Ends Policy: All Washington teachers will be assigned in roles appropriate for their state-issued certificate to ensure all students receive instruction from teachers who possess adequate knowledge and skills related to the subjects they teach.

Goal 7 - New standards and state system to guide approval and evaluation of providers of professional development that meet continuing education requirements

A state system of approved providers should help ensure that teachers have adequate access to high-quality professional development that will improve outcomes for students. Current standards for approving providers are minimal, and do not align with what is supported by research or promoted by the state. No central source of information exists on providers or opportunities, participant ratings of their offerings, or any other form of evaluation data.

Objective 1: Establish standards in WAC for all state-approved providers, reflecting: known research-based effective practices in professional development; the Washington Professional Development Guidelines; and alignment with Washington's certification standards for teachers, EALRs and GLEs.

Objective 2: Secure policy and funding support for the implementation of a web-based centralized professional development registry and evaluation system required for all state approved providers of professional development. Support interested districts and educators in effectively implementing the use of professional growth plans for certificate renewal.

Ends Policy: State-approved providers of professional development will be held to high quality standards that reflect certification standards and student learning improvement goals to ensure accountability for high-quality offerings.

Ends Policy: All Washington educators will have adequate access to information about, and opportunity to participate in, high-quality professional development that enhances their capacity to positively impact student learning.

Goal 8 - Enhanced access and expanded program delivery options for preservice educator preparation

A greater repertoire of options for educator preparation must be added to those that currently exist. There are still geographic regions in Washington State where individuals who wish to become educators lack reasonable access to a preparation program. Additionally, some individuals need greater flexibility in preparation program design to meet their needs.

Objective 1: Support institutions in implementing greater use of technology in preservice preparation; including greater use of online technology and strategies for more effective use of the K-20 network.

Objective 2:

2A. Expand alternative routes to teacher and principal certification and exploring an alternative route for school psychologists and speech-language pathologists.

2B. Expand cross-institutional consortia as a delivery model for educator preparation as a means for enhancing geographic access.

2C. Develop “pipeline” programs for paraeducators with transferable associate degrees that allows them to remain employed while completing requirements toward teacher certification

Objective 3: Explore an increased role for community colleges and ESDs.

Objective 4: Ensure that criteria for approving new preparation programs includes clear demonstration of how the program will expand current options, in terms of providing greater access and ability to address state goals and candidate needs.

Objective 5: Eliminate barriers for programs to transition to truly performance-based models, including:

5A. Addressing the disconnect between course and credit requirements and performance-based requirements.

5B. Transition from focus on course completion to identification of desired learner outcomes and means for assessing their attainment.

Ends Policy: All prospective educators in Washington will have affordable access to performance-based educator preparation programs regardless of geographic location to help ensure equity and an effective state system of supply and demand.

Goal 9 - Systemic and strategic approach to educator recruitment

We must focus collective resources and efforts on targeting of state needs to address shortages and increase diversity. Washington is experiencing shortages, in some cases severe, in specific teaching subject areas, educator roles, and geographic regions of the state

Objective 1:

1A. OSPI's, PEC Division, district/personnel administrators and the HECB convene annually the leadership of higher education educator preparation programs to discuss trends/projections in educator supply and demand and develop a collective strategy for impacting future enrollment.

1B. Facilitated and encourage efforts to combine district long-range forecasting of anticipated openings, associated field-based placements and cooperating/mentor teachers needed with higher education strategic enrollment planning.

Objective 2: Identify and eliminate unnecessary policy and practice barriers to entry into the professions.

Objective 3: Advocate for increased and coordinated financial incentives for entering targeted education professions.

Objective 4: Recognize non-school experience of ESAs and Plan 2 Career-Technical Education Teachers on the salary schedule

Objective 5:

5A. Identify and evaluate existing recruitment strategies that target different potential educator populations and direct state investment toward successful strategies.

5B. Convene colleges of education to share information and best practices related to program aimed at recruiting greater diversity in educator preparation.

Ends Policy: Financial and other forms of incentives, together with easily navigated processes for state certification, will encourage and facilitate prospective educators to practice in Washington State to ensure an adequate supply of highly qualified educators.

Ends Policy: Educator recruitment strategies will attract more diverse candidates to educator professions so that Washington's educator workforce will reflect the diversity of its student population.

Goal 10 - A state-supported, career-long continuum of educator development

A continuum of educator support is essential to ensuring the long-term success of our system of educator preparation and certification. Our best preparation and certification efforts are for naught if educators enter our schools feeling unsupported, experience ongoing obstacles to effective practice, and leave the profession.

Objective 1: Secure state policy and funding support for high-quality, sustained beginning teacher induction and mentoring including:

- 1A.** Induction support of adequate length for ALL new educators;
- 1B.** Research-based statewide standards for high-quality induction programs;
- 1C.** Exemplary models;
- 1D.** Clear links between beginning induction and pro cert, and guidance for districts in creating better linkages;
- 1E.** Expectations for mentor training and that clearly and consistently defined;
- 1F.** Support for districts to reduce beginning educator class/case load.

Objective 2: Support for the current workforce.

- 2A.** Fund professional development that clearly supports a career continuum;
- 2B.** Expand professional leadership development opportunities for principals;
- 2C.** Provide financial incentives for educators to pursue advanced certification that clearly benefits student learning;
- 2D.** Ensure equity of supports for all educators regardless of economic status of their school/district;
- 2E.** Re-align compensation with state system expectations.
- 2F.** Explore options for including private school teachers and administrators in state-sponsored professional development activities;

Objective 3: Continue improvements in implementation of the professional certificate for teachers, including:

- 3A.** Information / communication to preservice candidates from preservice programs and from districts to newly hired teachers raising awareness and understanding of professional certificate requirements.
- 3B.** Consistent statewide standards for assessing performance against pro-cert standards / agreed-upon standards for evidence
- 3C.** Assessing impact of professional certification on teaching practice and student learning
- 3D.** Greater clarity and consistency related to program requirements across all programs
- 3E.** Equitable access to, choices, and cost of programs statewide.

3F. Out-of-state experienced teachers – what should be required? Continued exploration of the potential reciprocity with other states.

3G. Consistency in Professional Growth Plan format across programs

3H. Financial burden to teachers without subsequent financial gain

3I. Alignment between requirements for professional certification and district/school learning improvement plans.

Ends Policy: All Washington educators will report receiving adequate professional support and resources to ensure they are effective in their professional roles throughout their career.

Appendix H

RCW 28A.150.210

Basic Education Act — Goal.

The goal of the Basic Education Act for the schools of the state of Washington set forth in this chapter shall be to provide students with the opportunity to become responsible citizens, to contribute to their own economic well-being and to that of their families and communities, and to enjoy productive and satisfying lives. To these ends, the goals of each school district, with the involvement of parents and community members, shall be to provide opportunities for all students to develop the knowledge and skills essential to:

- (1) Read with comprehension, write with skill, and communicate effectively and responsibly in a variety of ways and settings;
- (2) Know and apply the core concepts and principles of mathematics; social, physical, and life sciences; civics and history; geography; arts; and health and fitness;
- (3) Think analytically, logically, and creatively, and to integrate experience and knowledge to form reasoned judgments and solve problems; and
- (4) Understand the importance of work and how performance, effort, and decisions directly affect future career and educational opportunities.

[1993 c 336 § 101; (1992 c 141 § 501 repealed by 1993 c 336 § 1203); 1977 ex.s. c 359 § 2. Formerly RCW 28A.58.752.]

Notes:

Findings -- Intent -- 1993 c 336: "The legislature finds that student achievement in Washington must be improved to keep pace with societal changes, changes in the workplace, and an increasingly competitive international economy.

To increase student achievement, the legislature finds that the state of Washington needs to develop a public school system that focuses more on the educational performance of students, that includes high expectations for all students, and that provides more flexibility for school boards and educators in how instruction is provided.

The legislature further finds that improving student achievement will require:

- (1) Establishing what is expected of students, with standards set at internationally competitive levels;
- (2) Parents to be primary partners in the education of their children, and to play a significantly greater role in local school decision making;
- (3) Students taking more responsibility for their education;
- (4) Time and resources for educators to collaboratively develop and implement strategies for improved student learning;
- (5) Making instructional programs more relevant to students' future plans;
- (6) All parties responsible for education to focus more on what is best for students; and
- (7) An educational environment that fosters mutually respectful interactions in an atmosphere of collaboration and cooperation.

It is the intent of the legislature to provide students the opportunity to achieve at significantly higher levels, and to provide alternative or additional instructional opportunities to help students who are having difficulty meeting the essential academic learning requirements in RCW 28A.630.885.

It is also the intent of the legislature that students who have met or exceeded the essential academic learning requirements be provided with alternative or additional instructional opportunities to help advance their educational experience.

The provisions of chapter 336, Laws of 1993 shall not be construed to change current state requirements for students who receive home-based instruction under chapter 28A.200 RCW, or for students who attend state-approved private schools under chapter 28A.195 RCW." [1993 c 336 § 1.]

Effective date -- 1993 c 336 § 101: "Section 101 of this act shall take effect September 1, 1994." [1993 c 336 § 102.]

Findings -- 1993 c 336: "(1) The legislature finds that preparing students to make successful transitions from school to work helps promote educational, career, and personal success for all students.

(2) A successful school experience should prepare students to make informed career direction decisions at critical points in their educational progress. Schools that demonstrate the relevancy and practical application of course work will expose students to a broad range of interrelated career and educational opportunities and will expand students' posthigh school options.

(3) The school-to-work transitions program, under chapter 335, Laws of 1993, is intended to help secondary schools develop model programs for school-to-work transitions. The purposes of the model programs are to provide incentives for selected schools to:

- (a) Integrate vocational and academic instruction into a single curriculum;
- (b) Provide each student with a choice of multiple, flexible educational pathways based on the student's career interest areas;
- (c) Emphasize increased vocational and academic guidance and counseling for students;
- (d) Foster partnerships with local employers and employees to incorporate work sites as part of work-based learning experiences;
- (e) Encourage collaboration among middle or junior high schools and secondary schools in developing successful transition programs and to encourage articulation agreements between secondary schools and community and technical colleges.

(4) The legislature further finds that successful implementation of the school-to-work transitions program is an important part of achieving the purposes of chapter 336, Laws of 1993." [1993 c 336 § 601.]

Part headings not law -- 1993 c 336: "Part headings as used in this act constitute no part of the law." [1993 c 336 § 1204.]

Findings -- Part headings -- Severability -- 1992 c 141: See notes following RCW 28A.410.040.

Effective date -- Severability -- 1977 ex.s. c 359: See notes following RCW 28A.150.200.